11-15-68

ERIC REPORT RESUME

ERIC ACC. NO.				
ED 034 084				
CH ACC. NO.	P.A.	PUBL. DATE	ISSUE	
AA 000 444		69	RIEAPR70	

IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO ☒
ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☐ NO ☒
LEVEL OF AVAILABILITY I ☒ II ☐ III ☐

AUTHOR
Stollar, Dewey H.; And Others

TITLE
Research for School Board Members: Teacher Militancy, Negotiations, and Strikes. PREP-VIII.

SOURCE CODE	INSTITUTION (SOURCE)
XIE86100	Tennessee Univ., Knoxville
SP. AG. CODE: RMQ66004 RMQ66015	SPONSORING AGENCY

EDRS PRICE	CONTRACT NO.	GRANT NO.
0.25;1.60		
REPORT NO.		BUREAU NO.
PREP-8		

AVAILABILITY

JOURNAL CITATION

DESCRIPTIVE NOTE
30p.

DESCRIPTORS
*Teacher Militancy; *Teacher Strikes; *Collective Negotiations; Community Relations; Administration; *Board of Education Role

IDENTIFIERS
*Putting Research into Educational Practice (PREP)

ABSTRACT
The documents in this kit, second in a series on Research for School Board Members, analyzes the continuing rise in teacher militancy, the causes and effects on public education, community relations, methods of teaching and administration. Also discussed is the responsibility of School Boards and their administrators in dealing with the teachers to replace conflict with cooperation, and to see the work of militancy as beneficial, not detrimental to American children and their educational system. References and related documents available from ERIC are included. (LS)

ED 034 084

PREP

RESEARCH FOR SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS--

Teacher Militancy, Negotiations, and Strikes

No. 8

PREP is . . .

- *a synthesis and interpretation of research, development, and current practice on a specific educational topic*
- *a method of getting significant R&D findings to the practitioner quickly*
- *the best thinking of researchers interpreted by specialists in simple language*
- *the focus of research on current educational problems*
- *a format which can be easily and inexpensively reproduced for wide distribution*
- *raw material in the public domain which can be adapted to meet local needs*
- *an attempt to improve our Nation's schools through research*
- P *utting*
  R *esearch into*
  E *ducational*
  P *ractice*

The five documents in this kit, second in the series on Research for School Board Members, were written in connection with an interpretive studies project conducted by Dr. Dewey H. Stollar of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Titles of the documents are:

Causes of Teacher Militancy - No. 8-A

Trends in Teacher Strike Activity - No. 8-B

Decisive Factors in Potential Strike Situations - No. 8-C

Issues and Settlements in Teacher Strikes - No. 8-D

The Impact of Collective Negotiations Upon the Schools - No. 8- E

Also included in the kit is a list of some of the latest research documents on this topic entered into the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) system (No. 8-F).

Division of Information Technology and Dissemination

BUREAU OF RESEARCH/OFFICE OF EDUCATION

AA000444

IPRIP

No. 8-A

Causes of Teacher Militancy

Dr. Sam P. Sentelle
Department of Plant Properties
Richmond Public Schools
Richmond, Virginia

Teacher strikes and other overt forms of militancy have been an increasing problem for board members and school administrators for some time. Answers to certain questions about militancy have tremendous implications for those who must grapple with the realities of strike situations and find solutions for the problems which arise. If the causes are truly economic, as some would contend, then certain courses of action are clearly dictated. School authorities have to consider solutions which involve budgeting, fiscal support, and tax structure. On the other hand, if the keys to teacher militancy lie submerged in broader sociological issues, then economic diagnoses and treatments have the unfortunate consequences of relieving the symptoms without effecting a permanent cure.

Questions

Current literature on teacher militancy is characterized by a paucity of basic research and a plethora of opinion, by few answers but many ideas. Part of the difficulty stems from the abstract almost intangible nature of the subject itself.

1. What is militancy?

2. What are the basic reasons responsible for teacher strikes, sanctions, and general alienation of teachers from their publics?

3. Are the reasons commonly cited, those of salary and working conditions, actually at the root of the problem, or are these issues merely superficial with deeper underlying causes responsible for the growing dissension in educational ranks?

Division of Information Technology and Dissemination
BUREAU OF RESEARCH/OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Review of Studies

Although many of the current opinions remain essentially unsubstantiated by research, observers close to the action are generally in agreement. They tend to classify the reasons for teacher militancy in two major groupings. The first category includes economic reasons. Teachers are increasingly frustrated with economic inequity specifically and with the relative economic neglect of schools generally. The second category includes reasons related to change in working conditions and change in the fabric of the teaching profession. There has been a rapid decrease in the number of school districts and a consequent enlargement of the size of the average district. The number of young people in the teaching force, especially men, recently has been increasing steadily. Teachers are attaining increasingly higher levels of preparation and competence (13).

Teacher salaries. In the 40 years from 1925 to 1965 urban teacher salaries increased an average of 3.2 percent each year. During the same period teacher salary gains increased faster than consumer prices. Purchasing power of the teacher gained more than 90 percent, with half of this increment coming since 1951 (12).

The source of concern with teacher compensation is not that salaries have failed to increase--comparative earning trends indicate a sensitivity to pay changes for other groups of workers or to mutual factors affecting those changes--but that teacher pay has failed to keep pace with other occupational groups. In the period from 1939 to 1965, the average annual salaries of workers employed in eight broad occupational groups increased 3 1/2 times. This was proportionally greater in each case than average salaries of teachers which increased only 2 times in the same period (12). Over the postwar period to 1963, the proportional increase in teacher salaries nearly matched or bettered the pay gains of industrial workers. But teacher salaries started from a very low base. A generation ago teachers were paid less than industrial workers whose jobs required only an elementary education (16).

Between 1963 and 1965, all other groups outstripped teachers in salary gains. This was the time of the lowest rate of salary gain since the war, and it coincided with increased activity among teachers seeking improvements in their economic condition (11).

Recent surveys indicate that the disparity between teacher salaries and those of persons in other fields is increasing. As indicated in Table I, the difference in salary for beginning classroom teachers and colleges graduates entering private industry in 1965 was $1,867. By 1968, this figure had climbed to $2,430 (7,9).

Although salaries of beginning teachers are somewhat below starting salaries for college graduates in other fields, the largest discrepancies are to be found at the top of the scale. The compensation of mature teachers of exceptional competence falls substantially below that of equally competent people in many other vocations. Even the most talented elementary and secondary teachers in the Nation rarely receive more than $12,000 per year (16).

The deterioration in economic position of teachers relative to other occupational groups has been accentuated by the recent slackening of annual salary gains. Teachers are paid better today than every before, yet they are unable to keep pace with their neighbors in other occupational fields. Teachers want to keep up with the Joneses. They demand the right to share equitably in the fruits of an affluent socienty (11, 13).

Table I.—Average starting salaries of classroom teachers compared with those in private industry: 1965-66 through 1967-68.

	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69
Total (all fields)	$6,792	7,248	7,836	8,280
Beginning Teachers	4,925	5,142	5,519	5,850
Difference	1,867	2,106	2,317	2,430

Sources.--*Economic Status of the Teaching Profession, 1967-68*, Research Report 1968-R4, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1968, p. 44, cited by Henry Knapp, "A Tribute to the 'Real' Fathers," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 49:576, June, 1968. Teacher salaries estimated by NEA Research Division for school systems enrolling 6,000 or more pupils; salaries for all fields are based on offers made to graduates by approximately 200 companies nationwide, from annual reports of Frank S. Endicott, Director of Placement, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.

Changes in working conditions. The second factor in the upsurge of teacher restiveness is the changed working conditions and the changed fabric of the teaching profession. There has been a rapid decrease in the number of school districts with a consequent enlargement of the size of the average school district. Enlarged size of districts tends to impersonalize staff relationships. Communications between administration and staff become more complex and difficult. The result often is dissatisfaction and frustration, and a rebellious attitude tends to develop (13). Centralization of power in administration, great demand for conformity and impersonal relationships, factors which tend to increase with district size, are likely to be related to feelings of alienation from a school system (2).

In 1931 there were 127,422 school districts in the United States. By 1965 this number had dwindled to 24,500 operational districts (13). This tremendous growth in average system size and its accompanying difficulties have paralleled the growth of the so-called urban blight of the core cities. The gradual deterioration of schools in urban centers of the Nation is exemplified by the experience of one large Eastern city. Once a teacher's mecca boasting good pay and nationally known academic high schools, this city in 1962 had a lower starting salary than any of 104 surrounding school districts. The pay was so low for men that half

of them worked an average of 3 hours a day moonlighting. Although the city still had some of the best specialized schools in the country and more than its share of national scholarship winners, signs of decline were evident. Schools of the central city were left stagnant by a steady migration of the middle classes to private schools and the suburbs. In place of these students there was a growing population of children of economically disadvantaged minority groups. In 1963 these groups accounted for 76.5 percent of the elementary pupils in the city. They were more difficult to teach and highly transient. In some schools teachers ended the school year with a completely different set of students than they had had in the fall. One-third of all junior high school students were at least 2 years retarded in reading, 90,000 children could barely speak English, and less than half of them graduated (4).

More men and young people in teaching. There has been a recent and steady increase in the number of young people, especially men, in the teaching force. In the mid-fifties, about 26 percent of the public school teachers were men. By 1964, this figure had risen to 32 percent. The median age of teachers in 1964 was approximately 40 years, a drop from 43 years in the mid-fifties (3, 13). The increasing number of men in education is definitely related to the upsurge in teacher militancy. Men are more favorably inclined than women toward teacher collective action including negotiations, sanctions, and strikes (5). In all but one of the nine states experiencing teaching strikes in March, 1968, the percentage of men in the teaching force was higher than the national average (10).

Professionalism increasing. A final and related factor contributing to the growth of teacher militancy is the rising level of professionalism in educational ranks. Teachers are demanding more authority and responsibility because of their increasing professional competency. Fewer teachers hold substandard credentials than ever before. The proportion of teachers holding bachelor degrees increased from 60 percent in 1947 to 90 percent in 1963. In the same time, the percentage of teachers holding master's degrees or higher increased from 15 to 25 percent (14). Many teachers today assert that they are better qualified than their administrators to make curriculum decisions and organizational plans (16). Although all militant teachers are not necessarily professional, the more professionally oriented teachers appear to be among the most militant and the more professional teachers have the higher teaching credentials (6).

Professionalization by its very nature, says Ronald Corwin, must be a militant process. By definition, it is a drive for status. It represents the efforts of some members of a vocation to control their work, and in the process they will seek to take power from those groups which traditionally have controlled the vocation (6).

The basic underlying motive in teacher militancy, then, is a quest for power (15). The American school teacher today is younger, better educated, more active, and more highly skilled than ever before. At the same time, his services are in higher demand. Consequently he has become more demanding, more courageous, and more independent than ever before (1). He experiences a hunger for recognition as a professional with academic authority commensurate with his responsibilities (8).

Conclusions and Implications

A definite general analysis of the continuing rise in teacher militancy is a hazardous undertaking. Probably no absolute answer to the problem exists. The growing militancy seems to be another manifestation of a general feeling of restlessness and frustration symptomatic of a time of change. Possibly it has common roots with labor strikes, urban riots, and student revolts. The militancy seems to stem in part from a dissatisfaction with economic factors, those related to compensation and public support of education. In part, the militancy derives from changes in working conditions, the white migration to the suburbs, the increase in size of school districts, and deterioration of the central cities. A final source of militancy is the change which is taking place within the teaching profession itself, more men in teaching ranks, and generally teachers which are more competent and unafraid to make themselves heard.

The problem of teacher militancy is not one soon to be resolved, but one which can be approached only with fortitude, patience and understanding. The current wave of strikes will surely leave a permanent mark on public education, community relations, methods of teaching, and curriculum and administration. School boards and their administrators in actions and dealings with teachers must bear a certain responsibility to replace conflict with cooperation, to see that the mark of militancy is beneficial instead of detrimental to American children and their educational system.

REFERENCES

1. "Alonso, Cogen Agree on One Point," *Phi Delta Kappan*, XLIX (June, 1968), 560.

2. Barakat, Halim Isber. "Alienation From the School System: Its Dynamics and Structure." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1966.

3. Batchelder, Richard D. "Today's Militant Teachers," *NEA Journal*, LVIII (September, 1965), 18-19.

4. "Biggest Teachers' Strike," *Time*, LXXIX (April 20, 1962), 52.

5. Carlton, Patrick W. "The Attitudes of Certificated Instructional Personnel Toward Professional Negotiations and 'Sanctions.'" Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, Eugene, 1967.

6. Corwin, Ronald G. "Militant Professionalism, Initiative and Compliance in Public Education," *Sociology of Education*, XXXVIII (Summer, 1 1965), 310-330.

7. Knapp, Henry. "A Tribute to the 'Real' Fathers," *Phi Delta Kappan*, XLIX (June, 1968), 575-577.

8. Koontz, Elizabeth D. "Why Teachers are Militant," *Education Digest*, XXXIII (January, 1968), 12-14; *The Maryland Teacher*, XXV (October, 1967), 24-25, 39.

9. National Education Association. *Economic Status of the Teaching Profession, 1967-68*. Research Report 1968 - R 4. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1968.

10. Robinson, Donald W. "Teacher Militancy Around the Nation," *Phi Delta Kappan*, XLIX (June, 1968), 561-562

11. Sackley, Arthur. "Changes in Teachers' Salaries, 1963 to 1965," *Monthly Labor Review*, LXXXVIII (November, 1966), 1460-1464.

12. _____. "Long-Term Trends in Urban Teachers' Compensation," *Monthly Labor Review*, LXXXIX (December, 1965), 1223-1229.

13. Stinnett, T. M. *Turmoil in Teaching*. New York: MacMillan Company, 1968.

14. West, Allan M. "What's Bugging Teachers?" *Education Digest*, XXXI (February, 1966), 32-33; *Saturday Review*, XLVIII (October 16, 1965), 88.

15. Wildman, Wesley A. "What Prompts Greater Teacher Militancy?" *American School Board Journal*, CLIV (March, 1967), 27-32.

16. Woodring, Paul. "On the Causes of Teacher Discontent," *Saturday Review*, L (October 21, 1967), 61-62.

No. 8-B

TRENDS IN TEACHER STRIKE ACTIVITY

Dr. Sam P. Sentelle
Department of Plant Properties
Richmond Public Schools
Richmond, Virginia

Within the traditionally complacent ranks of the teaching profession a growing dissatisfaction is evident. On the contemporary educational scene, teacher militancy is erupting in strikes, professional sanctions and other overt forms which would have been unbelievable a few years earlier.

Questions

1. What has been the increase in frequency of teacher strikes in recent years?

2. Are there geographical patterns in teacher strikes?

3. Do teacher strikes tend to recur within the same school districts?

Review of Studies

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reported 33 work stoppages in 1966 alone. By contrast there were only 35 work stoppages in the entire decade prior to that year (2). The Research Division of the National Education Association listed 20 strikes during the same year of 1966. This represents a marked increase over the 5 preceding years for which an average of five strikes per year--a total of 23--was reported by the NEA (6). Both sources indicate through these data that teacher strike frequency during 1966 rose sharply when contrasted with statistics for previous years. But 1966 was only a portent of the deluge to come. NEA's Research Division recorded 105 strikes by school teachers during the year 1967, an annual increase of three to five hundred percent depending on base of reference (6). In the school year 1968-69 officials of both the American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association predicted three to four hundred work stoppages by teachers in all parts of the country. "We teachers are tired of all this being nice guys," announced a high school teacher. "Now we're applying some muscle " (4). And he echoed the mood of a growing faction of vociferous dissents.

Division of Information Technology and Dissemination
BUREAU OF RESEARCH/OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Scope of strike activity. Strikes by teachers during the 1967-68 school year, as reported by the NEA, occurred in 21 of the 50 States and the District of Columbia. Almost 163,000 teachers and approximately 1,4000,000 man-days of instruction were involved. In the 8-year period following 1960 there were statewide strikes and work stoppages in five States. Length of strikes and work stoppages varied from 1 day to more than 3 weeks (6).

Although strike activity is higher than ever and, by all indications, still increasing, statistics are often misleading. In the 1967-68 school year, according to the NEA, fewer than 8 percent of all teachers were involved in strikes. Man-days of instruction involved by teacher strikes totaled less than one-half of 1 percent of estimated man-days scheduled for the entire Nation. Moreover, in many systems, days lost because of strikes were rescheduled to meet State minimum attendance requirements (6).

Geographical patterns in teacher strikes. A particularly outstanding aspect of teacher strike activity little noted in the literature is its tendency to adhere, for the most part to definite geographical patterns. Of the total man-days involved in strikes or work stoppages, says the NEA, 90 percent were reported in three States (6). Friedman, in a study of teacher strikes from 1880 to 1964, noted a clustering of strikes in particular States by periods of time. Of 130 teacher strikes listed, 46 occurred in one State [1] (1). This is more than 4 times the number of strikes reported in the two States next in frequency, for the period of the study. These three States accounted for more than half of the teacher strikes listed. Furthermore, strikes tended to cluster in certain localities within these States.

Multiple strikes. Related perhaps to the phenomemon of geographical clustering of strikes sites is that of multiple strikes, another aspect of the problem which has received comparatively little attention in the literature. Considering that there were over 20,000 school districts in the United States in the fall of 1967 and only 148 teacher strikes from 1960 through that year, as reported by the NEA, the chance occurrence of two strikes occurring in the same school district is extremely small [2] (5, 6). Yet Goergen and Keough, in their study of 40 strikes, found that 10 of the districts studied had experienced other teacher strikes at some time. Moreover, in locations where multiple strikes had occurred, the same issues and outcomes were usually observed for all strikes in a particular district (3).

---

[1] The dissertation copy used by the project was a personal one loaned by Dr. Friedman and possibly not the final draft of his study.

[2] The random probability of two or more of these strikes occurring in a particular school district is less than one in a thousand.

Conclusions and Implications

In summary, teacher strikes have increased in recent years, with a sharp rise in strike frequency occurring in 1966. Man-days of instruction lost, however, are almost negligible in a national perspective partly because lost time due to strikes in many systems is rescheduled. Teacher strike activity tends to follow definite geographical patterns. Most strikes occur in relatively restricted areas, and there is a marked tendency for strikes to recur within a single school district.

REFERENCES

1. Friedman, Daniel David. "An Analytical Study of Strikes by Public School Teachers in the United States from 1880 to 1964." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, New York, 1966.

2. Glass, Ronald W. "Work Stoppages and Teachers: History and Prospect," *Monthly Labor Review*, XC (August, 1967), 43-46. *Research in Education*. ED 015 298.

3. Goergen, Joseph Henry, and John Joseph Keough. "Issues and Outcomes of Teachers' Strikes, 1955-1965." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, St. John's University, Jamaica, N.Y., 1967.

4. Star, Jack. "Our Angry Teachers," *Look*, XXXII (September 3, 1968), 64-68.

5. United States Office of Education, *Education Directory, 1967-68, Part 2, Public School Systems*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968.

6. Walker, Donald P. *Teacher Strikes and Work Stoppages, January 1940 to July 1968*. Research Memo 1968 - 15. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, November 1968.

PRIP No. 8-C

DECISIVE FACTORS IN POTENTIAL STRIKE SITUATIONS

Dr. Sam P. Sentelle
Department of Plant Properties
Richmond Public Schools
Richmond, Virginia

Several factors, some more than others, appear to foment teacher strikes and potential strike situations. In dealing with these factors, board members and administrators often must assign priorities to their areas of concern. This task becomes critical in the school district faced with a strike threat, and the answers to the following questions can mean the difference between actual work stoppage and averted strike.

Questions

1. What factors are most important in teacher strikes and potential strike situations according to teachers?

2. What are the decisive factors in the teacher strike? In other words what factors can spell the difference between strike and averted strike?

Review of Study

One known investigation has attempted to identify decisive factors in potential strike situations: In 1964, a comparison study testing differences in questionnaire responses by two groups of teachers was completed at the University of Mississippi. The first group of teachers had been involved in a strike; the second group had experienced a situation in which a strike had threatened but subsequently failed to materialize. The research attempted to identify especially those factors contributing to a strike situation which, when changed, might serve to avert the strike (1).

The study included every reported teacher strike and averted strike in the United States between 1952 and 1963. Strike votes, published threats, or verbal threats by acknowledged leadership were criteria for identification of potential strikes.

Division of Information Technology and Dissemination
BUREAU OF RESEARCH/OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Questionnaire items, 33 in all, were categorized within four major classifications: economic, political, organizational structure, and personnel policy and job environment. Responses from 181 teachers, 113 in the strike group and 68 in the averted strike group, indicated a significant difference of opinion between the two groups on items related to organizational structure of local school districts. Some of these items listed in order of relative importance are given here:

1. Boards of education were fiscally dependent on other government bodies. Responding teachers indicated fiscal dependence was an important contributing factor in situations where strikes had occurred, much more so than in other instances where strikes had been threatened but subsequently were averted.

2. There was a failure to establish channels of communication between teachers and their various supervisors and administrators where strikes had occurred more so than in situations where strikes had been averted.

3. Teachers were not permitted to participate in policy determination. This item was rated more important by the strike teachers than by the averted strike teachers.

Both groups were in agreement that certain economic factors had contributed to cause strikes and to create potential strike situations. Teachers went on strike or threatened strike over low salaries. Strike potential increased, the responding groups indicated, when demands for higher salaries and proposed salary schedules were rejected. In addition, the danger of strike increased upon failure of efforts to improve salary and welfare through bargaining procedures.

There were significant differences between the response groups on the following items:

1. Limits on taxation contributed to create potential strike situations, but this factor was not considered nearly so important by teachers who had been in actual strikes.

2. Likewise, defeat of a referendum for school tax increase was considered much more significant in potential strike situations than in actual strikes.

3. Fiscal dependence of boards, as noted previously, was thought to be much more significant in actual strike situations than in potential strike situations.

4. Inadequate working conditions and hours, according to the respondents, were more important in contributing to potential strike situations than as a contributing factor in actual strikes.

Conclusions and Implications

Fiscal dependence of boards of education on other government bodies, according to teacher responses, has been a primary decisive factor between teacher strike incidents and potential strike situations. The study also noted that strike potential increased whenever wage demands were rejected and upon failure of collective bargaining procedures. These factors, in all likelihood, are related: Conceivably, in many instances of threatened strike, wage demands were rejected and bargaining procedures failed simply because of the fact that the board was fiscally dependent. As a consequence of this dependence, the board lacked the necessary flexibility for dealing with the problems at hand.

REFERENCE

1. Kite, Robert Hayman, Sr. "A Study to Determine the Degree of Influence Selected Factors Had in Causing Teacher Strikes and to Determine the Degree to Which These Factors Were Present in School Districts in Which Teacher Strikes Were Averted." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi, University, 1964.

PRICE

No.8-D

ISSUES AND SETTLEMENTS IN TEACHER STRIKES

Dr. Sam P. Sentelle
Department of Plant Properties
Richmond Public Schools
Richmond, Virginia

The teacher strike typically finds school board members unprepared in terms of information and experience to deal with the crisis. Often the conflicts are unintentionally inflamed by those who underestimate the significance of rapid contemporary changes in teacher attitudes and working conditions.

Questions

The review of issues and settlements in teacher strikes which follows will consider the following questions:

1. What are common characteristics of teacher strikes?

2. What patterns of issues and settlements have been established?

3. Has there been a consistent relationship between issues and settlements?

Review of Studies

Goergen and Keough at St. John's University completed an analytical study of teacher strikes in 1967. The investigation covered the decade from 1955 through 1965 and considered issues and demands of the striking teachers together with outcomes and settlements ultimately achieved. The researchers were able to group the 40 strikes listed in their study into six definite patterns according to the basic issues involved: dismissal of personnel, demand for wage increase, unpaid back wages, poor State tax structure for support of education, collective bargaining, and both wage increase and collective bargaining (5).

Dismissal of personnel. Of the 40 strikes studied, dismissal of personnel was an issue in three. In each case the superintendent of schools was involved. In two cases the superintendent had been dismissed by the board of education, and in the third strike a major issue was denial of tenure status to a group of teachers by the superintendent. Outcomes of these strikes were favorable to the superintendents but unfavorable to the teachers. Both superintendents

were reinstated, but tenure denial to teachers was upheld. In all three strikes, a request for investigation was made to an outside agency; and these strikes, more so than with strikes in other patterns, were further characterized by displays of emotion and involvement of the general public.

In a 1955 strike in a Southwestern city, which set a record for length of duration at 59 days, a police guard was necessary. Following the dismissal of the superintendent by the board of education, most of the employees of the school system went on strike--clerical, custodial, and lunchroom personnel as well as teachers and principals. The board discharged the striking employees en masse, and attempted to operate the schools with volunteer workers. A little more than a month later, the taxpayers of the school district called for a referendum and voted by a substantial margin to dissolve the district. By this action, in effect, the citizens dismissed the board of education. A new district with a new board of education was formed and the superintendent rehired at his former salary with back pay. Most of the teachers who had walked out were rehired by the new board; but they, unlike the superintendent, were not granted back pay. These results were true to the pattern in that outcomes tended to favor superintendents.

In each of the three cases classified by Goergen and Keough in this category, other issues reported were unilateral decisionmaking by the board of education and lack of effective vertical communication within the school organization.

Demand for wage increase. In seven of the 40 strikes studied, demand for salary increase was the only apparent issue. A standard order of events was identified in this strike pattern: Teachers demanded a raise, the board refused their demands, teachers went on strike in protest, and usually the teachers were granted a wage increase after the first or second day of the strike. The settlement was usually a compromise, and in fiscally dependent school districts, the mayor usually became involved in settlement negotiations.

Unpaid back salaries. Unpaid back salaries was a principal issue in five of the 40 strikes investigated by Goergen and Keough. The strikes in this pattern generally occurred in financially depressed areas and in districts in which tax payments were delinquent. Three of the five strikes occurred in one State, which has a long record for delayed pay. All three strikes in this State occurred in one region, and each differed in outcome.

In one of these three strikes, teachers refused to teach after working more than 3 months without pay. Money was borrowed to compensate teachers for 1 month after which the strike ended immediately. Following the strike, the board of education began a drive against tax delinquents. Estimated tax arrears involved enough money to pay teachers and support personnel for a full 9 months. In a second school district, teachers had remained on the job without pay for over 8 months before going on strike. The school board reacted to the crisis by dissolving the school district and transferring pupils to other districts. Teachers received their back pay, but lost their jobs.

In the third case, the school district had had a quarter century history of erratic teacher compensation. At the time of the teacher strike reported by Goergen and Keough, salaries were 3 months overdue. A delegation from the State education agency was sent to mediate the stoppage. Teachers returned to classes 12 days later and were paid back salaries after the annual State tax appropriation, a solution initially rejected by the teachers. At the time of the strike, the school district was operating on the same tax rate that it had been 10 years earlier. The district was directed to raise tax rates in order to meet obligations.

A State department survey completed at approximately the time of this strike showed over one million dollars in back salaries owed by school districts in this region of the State. Forty-six of the 130 strikes reported by Friedman occurred in this State, and 33 of these were in the one region of the State. (3)

Striking for back salaries has become relatively infrequent when compared with earlier periods. In most cases the lack of funds resulted from local failure to meet the minimum revenue receipts for the State. The immediate outcome of these strikes has usually been a solution of the financial crisis. In one State, the legislature in 1959 enacted the Distressed School Districts Act to enable the State to correct some of the conditions that caused the strikes (3,5).

Poor State tax structure to support education. The fourth pattern observed by Goergen and Keough was one in which a poor State tax structure appeared to be the major contributing factor in strike situations. The conflict in the 11 strikes classified in this pattern appeared to exist between teachers and politicians rather than between teachers and school boards. Usually these strikes occurred in large city school districts. In other cases when the entire State struck, the more militant groups were to be found in the large urban areas. In all but one of these strikes, salary was a primary issue. Denial of a salary raise which teacher groups believed to be justified appeared to move teachers toward a strike. In many of these strikes the State level of educational support was below that of neighboring States.

Many teacher strikes as compared with industrial strikes have taken the form of protest to the public or the legislature rather than against the school authorities. One statewide stoppage is illustrative: Most of the teachers observed a professional study day to protest the State education budget. The governor responded by establishing a special commission to make recommendations on additional means of financial help (4).

Seven of the 11 tax structure strikes occurred in one part of a single State. In instances where State laws prohibited strikes by government employees, teachers were absent from work because of "personal reasons." In one school district, schools were closed when 90 percent of the teachers failed to report for work on Monday morning because of "sickness." The teachers were seeking an across-the board salary increase and were supported in this demand by the school board. The town commissioners were accused of creating financial difficulties and of holding "secret sessions."

Teachers demands were refused despite support of those demands by the board of education and the superintendent. At the end of the school year, about 20 percent of the teachers resigned their positions (3).

In these strikes where the State tax structure was inadequate, the local demands for wage increases usually were not granted. In most instances, however, there was eventual though not immediate legislation to provide more money for education.

Collective bargaining. In teacher strikes of the collective bargaining category, a major demand was the right of teacher organizations to negotiate with school board members on the basis of equal status. Boards of education generally tended to resist these demands by citing statutes or their own bylaws. Sometimes a board would choose simply to ignore teacher demands. Board members in other instances made strong public statements that teacher representatives could not be considered equals in negotiations.

Goergen and Keough emphasize the negatives in the collective bargaining strike pattern. No evidence was found in any case where teachers, administrators, and board members attempted to reach a detailed agreement concerning mutual functions or roles. There was no instance in which board and administration questioned the competency of teachers to share the decisionmaking process. Finally, there was no instance in which board and administration attempted to obligate teachers to responsibilities commensurate with such a role. Attempts to establish collective bargaining rights, as these attempts appeared in strike situations, developed into power struggles in which teachers demanded and boards resisted. This is a theme that recurs frequently in the literature on teacher militancy: The underlying motivating force is not so much a protest over economic or working conditions as it is a quest for power.

For teaching, as a vocation, is in a process of professionalization. By its very nature, professionalization is a militant process. In essence, it is a drive for status representing the efforts of some members of a vocation to control their work. In seeking this control, the vocation will attempt to wrest power from those groups which traditionally have controlled the vocation (2).

Of the teacher strikes studied, collective bargaining was in six instances the principal or sole issue. In five of these strikes an issue of rivalry between teacher organizations was present. Injunctions, in two cases where they were used, were ineffective. There was litigation in both of these cases which had no apparent relation to the injunctions.

Salary increases and collective bargaining. In eight of the strikes studied by Goergen and Keough, collective bargaining was closely related to a demand for increased salary. Teacher groups were not deterred from their demands by legal deadlines for school budgets. In some cases, the board actually granted salary increases after the budget deadline. In these instances, all or part of the increases were financed by funds accumulated through nonpayment of salaries during the strike. Power seems to have been a basic issue in this strike pattern, as well as salary. Teacher groups in these groups attempted to regulate the action of the school board. There were demands that teachers be accorded a degree of dignity and respect by their boards, that they be permitted to negotiate with boards as equals, and that negotiation rights be recognized in some form of written document. Interpretation of a written agreement was the basis of contention in three of the eight strikes.

Court injunctions ended most of the strikes in this pattern. Teachers returned to school usually without realizing substantial settlement of their demands. Where salary increases were realized, these generally were very modest. No specific agreement by the school boards to share any part of the policymaking functions resulted from any of the eight strikes. Teacher groups in these cases tended to give more publicity to gains which suggested teacher influence in the policymaking process than to financial gains.

Patterns related to outcome. The St. John's study revealed that, in every instance where unpaid back salary was a strike issue, a result of the strike was payment of this salary.

In strikes where salary was the only major issue, the result of the strike action was an actual increase in salary in all cases but one. The settlement was usually a compromise between salary demanded by the teachers and that offered by the board.

Where the State tax structure was a strike issue, an improvement in the tax structure occurred in every case within 2 years of the latest strike in this pattern. In most of the cases, teachers did not receive a salary increase.

Conclusions and Implications

The 40 teacher strikes which occurred in the decade from 1955 through 1965 tended to follow definite patterns of demands and settlements. Eleven of the 40 strikes appeared to grow out of problems related to State tax structure and State fiscal support of education. The issues in eight of the strikes involved collective bargaining and wage increases. Demand for wage increase alone was the primary issue in seven strikes; collective bargaining in six cases was the primary issue. Five strikes resulted from unpaid back wages, and personnel dismissal caused the remaining three strikes.

Probably no immediate definitive and satisfactory solution to the teacher strike exists. The best counsel seems to be that of patience and understanding; for while board members often have found themselves in difficult positions in strike situations, they have in many instances aggravated the conflict still further by rash actions and decisions made without adequate knowledge.

School boards generally underestimate the seriousness of the warning signals which precede a strike. A 1967 strike in a small Eastern city illustrates this point: The crisis according to one administrator was characterized by "bad personal relations, bad functioning and complete ignorance of a new kind of teacher--the teacher who is ready to clobber his community if his demands are not met." The problem was a lack of awareness, sophistication, and realism in dealing with young and militant teachers (1).

Strikes appear to follow definite patterns. This means that, while there may be no set answer for board members and administrators, they might anticipate the difficulties and benefit from past experiences in other school systems.

REFERENCES

1. Brawn, Robert J. "Anatomy of a Strike; What Really Happened in Woodbridge," *School Management*, XI (May, 1967), 76-82 +.

2. Corwin, Ronald G. "Militant Professionalism, Initiative and Compliance in Public Education," *Sociology of Education*, XXXVIII (Summer, 1965), 310-330.

3. Friedman, Daniel David. "An Analytical Study of Strikes by Public School Teachers in the United States from 1880 to 1964." Inpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, New York, 1966.

4. Glass, Ronald W. "Work Stoppages and Teachers: History and Prospect," *Monthly Labor Review*, XC (August, 1967), 43-46. *Research in Education*. ED 015 298.

5. Goergen, Joseph Henry, and John Joseph Keough. "Issues and Outcomes of Teachers' Strikes, 1955-1965." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, St. John's University, Jamaica, New York, 1967.

IPRIP No. 8-E

THE IMPACT OF COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS UPON THE SCHOOLS

Dr. James D. Wilson
Department of Educational Administration
Western Carolina University
Cullowhee, North Carolina

The increasing use of the process of collective negotiations between teachers and boards of education has created some uneasiness about the impact this process is having upon the schools. This is especially true in regard to decisionmaking in school systems. Conflict over the right to control decisions affecting the schools has led to impasse situations, sometimes resulting in teacher strikes and the closing of schools. While research in this area cannot provide school board members with "tried and true" answers, it can provide some indication of what changes have occurred as a result of negotiations and suggest possible ways of approaching negotiations in the future.

Questions

1. What do teachers hope to gain through collective negotiations?
2. What aspects of school operations and decisionmaking have been altered because of negotiations?
3. What factors influence the occurrence of impasses?
4. How may impasses be dealt with?
5. How should boards of education approach the process of negotiations?

Review of Studies

Love (2) conducted a study to determine the extent of teacher participation in decisionmaking through collective negotiations. Data were collected through a questionnaire sent to 170 school districts and through interviews with school board members, administrators, and teachers in six school systems, as well as the analysis of written negotiation agreements collected from a

number of school systems. Love maintained that, in addition to pursuing collective negotiations as a means of obtaining better salaries and better working conditions, teachers also sought to use collective negotiations to "obtain meaningful participation in decisionmaking." Therefore, he attempted to contrast the extent to which teachers participated in decisionmaking in school systems which engaged in collective negotiation and the extent to which teachers were involved in decisionmaking in school systems which did not engage in collective negotiations.

The study found that collective negotiation does give teachers greater opportunity to participate in decisionmaking. This is especially true in large school systems where one teacher organization holds exclusive representation rights and where State law encourages the development of collective negotiation between teachers and school systems. Collective negotiations do serve to reduce somewhat the power of the school administration and the board of education. However, "administrators quickly learn to use the negotiation process to preserve areas of discretion, and school boards retain their right to represent the public interest and to make all final decisions" (2).

The impact of collective negotiations has been much more important in deciding personnel policies than educational policies. The items most often considered for negotiation are: salary schedule, leave policies, class size, transfer policy, and teachers' supervisory duties. While decisions involving the content, materials, and techniques of education are almost never negotiated, non-negotiation decision processes are being created to give teachers greater voice in these decisions (2).

In a comprehensive study to determine the impact of collective negotiations on the schools, especially on the decisionmaking process, Perry and Wildman made case studies of the history of collective negotiations between teachers and boards of education in 22 communities (6). Collective negotiations in the districts studied had become a compromise process based upon the exercise of group power as the ultimate basis for decisionmaking. Many persons who had to operate under collective negotiation agreements claimed that the system did not permit the best approaches to solving problems or adapting to changing circumstances. Outside observers agreed and questioned whether politically and economically motivated short-run decisions could promote quality education in the long run. Wildman found little evidence that collective negotiations had reduced the freedom of boards of education to set basic policy or the discretion of administrators to implement policy; however, the potential exists for negotiation to bring about considerable changes in the power of school boards, administrators, and teacher organizations.

Collective negotiation has led school authorities to increase their efforts to convince the local community and the agencies which have physical authority over the schools of the need for additional resources. Some of these appeals have made reference to collective negotiations and the power of teachers to disrupt the school system. In some cases teacher organizations have assisted in attempting to persuade the public to increase support of the schools. In

other instances they have not, either because they fear being bound by the results of such appeals or because they feel they may alienate the community. Larger school districts have succeeded in gaining additional funds from State governments to meet the physical demands brought about by negotiation agreements. Smaller districts have not succeeded in these efforts. Most districts have obtained local fiscal support, at least in the short run. In some cases, additional support was achieved for nonsalary areas of the school budget. However, teachers were the major beneficiaries of increased support. The short-run increases in teachers' salaries brought about by negotiations have been met by shifting resources to education within levels of government and shifting resources to teachers' salaries within the local school budgets (6).

A study conducted at the Ohio State University centered on determining the current degree of collective activity among classroom teachers and the extent to which attitudes of teachers, school administrators, and school board members were in agreement about the role classroom teachers should play in decisionmaking within the school system. The attitudes of teachers, administrators, and board members in a single State were assessed by having them respond to an attitude inventory constructed by the researcher which related to areas of concern and negotiations. Items composing the instrument were taken from the literature in the field of collective negotiations as well as statements from college professors and practitioners (7).

While the concept of negotiation was accepted by teachers, administrators, and board members, there were degrees of differences among the three groups. Largest difference in attitude toward collective negotiation existed between teachers and school board members. The second largest difference was between teachers and school superintendents. Superindents and members of boards of education had the greatest agreement of attitudes toward collective negotiations, especially upon the subjects that should be submitted for negotiation. Many superintendents were uncertain about what the procedures for negotiation should be and about the role they should play in the negotiating process (7).

A case study of the collective negotiation process between a city board of education and the local education association was undertaken to assess the impact of a mandatory collective bargaining law passed by the State legislature. The study covered the period from the passage of the law through the first master teacher contract agreement slightly more than a year later. The study concluded that collective bargaining had intruded on the traditional decision-making authority of the board of education. The teacher contract finally agreed upon included binding arbitration which gave a third party a decision-making function over the board of education. A source of conflict between the board of education and the teachers organization which eventually led to a teacher strike was lack of communication between the board of education and the teacher organization. The teachers claimed that this lack of communication resulted because the board of education would not give them an opportunity to express their desires. The study recommended that the board of education and the teacher organization capitalize on such positive benefits

of collective negotiations as clarification of policy, definition of teachers' rights and responsibilities, definition of the roles of central office administration, and definition of the role of principals. The study also recommended that the board of education budget funds for research and for inservice activities in order that the board may secure a background in collective negotiations. The study strongly urged that boards of education negotiate for quality teaching in return for higher salaries (1).

Another study explored the impact of collective negotiation on existing State laws concerned with educational matters. The findings point to the potential conflict between tenure laws and laws dealing with collective bargaining rights of teachers, particularly when the two laws are enacted at different times (3).

Wildman used a survey questionnaire to gather information about teacher negotiations from a sample of 6,023 school systems in the United States which had enrollments of 1,200 or more. A 70 percent response was received, with only five States responding below 50 percent. Fifty-five of the districts which responded to the questionnaire provided for the use of specific procedures in case of an impasse in negotiations. The procedures can be classified as providing for one of the following:

1. The use of a consultant or mediator whose duties are largely unspecified.

2. The use of a third party to make recommendations for settlement to the parties involved.

3. The use of a third party to make recommendations to the parties involved and to the general public.

4. The use of a third party to make recommendations to the parties involved and *then* to the public if the recommendations do not lead to settlement.

5. The use of a third party to make recommendations with the power to refer the dispute to the State superintendent if the recommendations do not lead to settlement (9).

In the interaction between the teachers organizations and the school management, the superintendent had the primary responsibility for representing the schools in 60 percent of the districts sampled. In 15 percent of the districts, he shared this responsibility with the board of education. But in 25 percent of the districts, the superintendent was not involved at all in representing the school management. In districts where the board of education had not delegated authority to the superintendent to act on the request of teacher organizations, teachers seemed to focus their efforts on the board (9).

Perry reported on eight case studies of school districts in which impasses occurred in processes of negotiations. One similarity which seemed to exist in all of the districts was that teachers had not been effectively represented in the years immediately preceding the occurrence of the impasses. Perry concluded that teachers had overestimated the decisionmaking power which they could gain through negotiations. In some districts teachers seemed to believe that, once negotiations were established, school boards could not refuse to accept teacher demands. Teachers felt that they could use collective negotiations to force not only the school boards but also the community-at-large to allow teachers to determine the needs of the school districts (5).

> *While it was the nature and level of teacher expectations which gave rise to impasses, it was the nature of the board of education's views of the meaning of collective bargaining which determined the form taken by conflict. Where a board had committed itself to collective bargaining, the impasses centered on economic issues. Where a board of education had accepted collective bargaining, economic conflict was translated into conflict over control of the system and its long-run as well as short-run goals (5).*

Conclusions and Implications

While the major concern of teachers in collective negotiation has been the improvement of salary and working conditions, teachers have also attempted to include a wide range of items in addition to these. If school officials are to deal effectively with the movement toward collective negotiations, they must be aware that teachers want an increased voice in the decisions that affect them(8).

Robert Ohm maintains that the emergence of collective activity on the part of teachers and the conflicts that these activities have generated have been brought about by the teachers' desire for professionalization. One of the most important qualifications of a profession is that it be able to have control of decisions that are based upon professional knowledge. Where the schools are concerned, many of the decisions that should be based upon a technical knowledge of education are not made by the teachers who are the educational professionals, but rather by lay boards of education and by administrators who, in many cases, may be out of touch with the situations about

which they are making decisions. The conflicts that are arising are really organizational conflicts brought about by the traditional way school districts have been organized to function. These conflicts arise between those who hold the position of authority within the organizational structure and those who do not hold authority positions but believe themselves to have specialized training to carry out complex roles within the organization (3).

Ohm also maintains that an increase in power and control by teachers does not necessarily mean a decrease in the power and control of administrators and boards of education. Such a view, he says, is based on the assumption that there is a limited amount of power available to the school system and that any power teachers come to possess consequently means a decrease in the power of the other elements of the school system. According to Ohm, this assumption is wrong. The total power of a school system can be increased and the activities of organized teachers will help to increase the power of the school system. "Strong, formally organized groups of teachers have influence or power in the larger community or social system and this power can be mobilized and used for the benefit of the school" (4).

Knowledge of the factors that are motivating teachers will not be enough to solve all of the administrator's problems in regard to collective negotiations. Other questions concerning bargaining units, what is to be negotiated, how to get ready for negotiations, and how the administrator can negotiate in a situation where he is a representative of the public and responsible to an elective board must also be answered.

Preparing for negotiations consumes a great deal of time. The preparation involves the selection of a negotiation team, planning the general position of the schools in regard to the negotiations, and even setting forth specific contract proposals which the school authorities want to see incorporated into the agreement. Because of the time involved, school boards will have to leave much of the preparation for negotiations to staff members. In some cases it may even be necessary for school boards to employ outside counsel or other experienced persons to help them prepare for the negotiation sessions. Reviewing negotiation agreements reached in other school systems would be especially helpful to the system which is negotiating for the first time. Attention should be paid to the areas about which employees organizations want to negotiate. These areas include such matters as salaries, promotion systems, vacations, pension and retirement systems, sabbaticals, and leaves of absence. In addition, those planning for the negotiation should consider other areas which might possibly arise in the negotiation session. These areas include such items as class size, instructional load, specialized services, teacher aides, and grievance procedures (8).

In regard to the negotiations process itself, Rehmus indicates that most negotiators have learned how to negotiate by watching others in the process. From the standpoint of school authorities, it would be best for them to hire professionals to negotiate for them. Considering that many school systems, especially small ones, cannot afford to proceed in this manner, they should insure that the persons negotiating for the school system are fair and firm and believe that the teachers have a legitimate right to negotiate with the school board. Difficult issues should be faced and discussed thoroughly, and trickery should be avoided.

It is extremely important that those who represent the schools in the negotiations be fully familiar with the day-to-day operation of the system in order that they will not unknowingly make commitments that would unduly hamper the operation of the system (8).

A major problem faced by school systems when entering negotiations is the uncertainty of the revenues that may be available to the school system during the course of the school year. While there are not completely satisfactory solutions to this problem, Rehmus recommends some possible approaches. The school board might wait until the amount of revenue is known and then negotiate on how the money will be distributed. Negotiations could proceed in phases, with the first phase devoted to negotiating salary schedules where the revenue is known and later negotiation sessions could deal with other matters which would be dependent upon more definite knowledge of the total revenue available for the school year. Another possible solution would be to negotiate on alternative agreements, dependent upon what revenues would become available (8).

Fulfilling the agreements reached in negotiations creates new situations for the school administration. Planning programs may be necessary to help administrators understand how the provisions of the negotiated contract are to be carried out. It is very important for the administrative officials to have a complete understanding of any grievance procedures which have been negotiated (8).

In some cases, school system officials and teachers will not be able to reach an agreement on some items in the negotiation procedure. There is, certainly, always the possibility of a strike on the part of the employees, however, there are many other ways that disagreement can be overcome. Among these are such procedures as "off-the-record" conferences, studies by special committees, mediation and conciliation, and occasionally reference to outside or higher level fact findings. One of the most productive ways for overcoming disagreement is for the school officials to look at the union's proposal as a possible solution to a problem for which there may be several other solutions, some of which would be more acceptable to the school officials (8).

Allowing teachers to have greater voice in the decisionmaking process of a school system within the structure of which most school systems now operate is a difficult process. At present, school board members and the administrators they hire are held responsible by the public for the operation of the schools. If something goes wrong, these are the people who must bear the responsibility for what has happened. Unless ways can be found whereby individual teachers can be held more responsible for their conduct and for the professional decisions, teachers are not likely to secure a greater voice in influencing school decisions (4).

REFERENCES

1. Lehman, Robert Hayes. "Collective Bargaining Under Michigan Statutes: A Case Study and Interaction Analysis of the Negotiation Between the Board of Education, Flint, Michigan, and the Flint Education Association." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, Detroit, 1967.

2. Love, Thomas Michael. "The Impact of Teacher Negotiations on School System Decision-Making." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1968.

3. Meeder, Jack E. "A Study of Attitudes and Problems Relating to State-Wide Tenure and Compulsory Bargaining for Teachers in Michigan." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1968.

4. Ohm, Robert E. "Collective Negotiations--Implications for Research," *Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration*, Roy B. Allen and John Schmid, editors. Columbus, Ohio: The University Council for Educational Administration, 1966. Pp.97-113.

5. Perry, Charles R. *Collective Action by Public School Teachers*, Volume III, *Impasse Resolution in Teacher Negotiations*. Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968.

6. Perry, Charles R., and Wesley A. Wildman. *The Impact of Teacher Bargaining on the Schools*, Volume IV, *Collective Action by Public School Teachers*. Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968.

7. Queen, Bernard. "Relationship of Teacher Collective Activity to Attitudes of Classroom Teachers, School Administrators, and School Board Members." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus, 1967.

8. Rehmus, Charles M. "Public Management and Collective Negotiations," *Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration*, Roy B. Allen and John Schmid, editors. Columbus, Ohio: The University Council for Educational Administration, 1966. Pp. 61-72.

9. Wildman, Wesley A., and Robert K. Burns. *Teacher Organizations and Collective Action*, Volume I, *Collective Action by Public School Teachers*. Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968.

IRIC

CURRENT DOCUMENTS ON--

TEACHER MILITANCY, NEGOTIATIONS, AND STRIKES

No. 8-F

Abstracts of the following documents appear in recent monthly issues of *Research in Education*, the official journal of the Educational Resources Information Center. The complete document may be ordered from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, The National Cash Register Company, 4936 Fairmont Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland 20014 in either microfiche (MF) or hard copy (HC). The identification number, pages, and cost are given for each document.

A Journal of Collective Negotiations. ED 024 110. 115 p. MF - 50¢; HC - $5.85.

Areas of Conflict Between Adminsitrators and Teachers. A New Mexico Report. ED 025 031. 41 p. MF - 25¢; HC - $2.15.

Selected Bibliography on Collective Negotiations. ED 024 133. 12 p. MF - 25¢; HC - 70¢.

The Processes of Face-to-Face Negotiations. ED 024 107. 16 p. MF - 25¢: HC - 90¢.

Collective Negotiations in the Public Schools. ED 024 146. 10 p. MF - 25¢; HC - 60¢.

Labor Law and Education. Report of the Work Conference on Collective Bargaining (Denver, Colo., July 8-19, 1968). ED 025 020. 98 p. MF - 50¢: HC - $5.

Teacher Salary Negotiations: A Case Study and Analysis. ED 025 848. 90 p. MF - 50¢; HC - $4.60.

Negotiations Bibliography. ED 023 178. 46 p. MF - 25¢; HC - $2.40.

Division of Information Technology and Dissemination

BUREAU OF RESEARCH/OFFICE OF EDUCATION